

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Okamoto. Claim 1 recites, “a data table for storing therein locus data which contains locus display data and adjusting data, said locus display data being used to display a travel predicted locus of the vehicle corresponding to a steering angle of a steering wheel on the screen, and said adjusting data being used to adjust a display position of the travel predicted locus on the screen based upon said locus display data.”

Claim 1 requires a data table containing locus data. The locus data includes locus display data and adjusting data. The locus display data is used to display a travel predicted locus according to a steering wheel angle. The adjusting data adjusts a display position on the screen of the travel predicted locus. The adjusting data adjusts for camera imperfections, such as an unintended roll angle or pan angle due to improper camera installation.

Okamoto teaches that a predicted vehicle route image TR1 is generated based on outputs from a wheel speed sensor 5 and a steering angle sensor 6. The predicted vehicle image TR1 is read out from a memory 105 and displayed on a display 12 (4:41-48). Neither the speed sensor output nor the steering angle sensor output provide the claimed “adjusting data.” The speed sensor output and the steering angle sensor output directly determine the predicted vehicle route image TR1. Neither output *adjusts a display position* on a screen of *travel predicted locus*. In other words, the speed sensor output and the steering angle sensor output help to *determine* a travel locus, but they do not *adjust a display position* of an existing travel locus.

Okamoto further teaches both the predicted vehicle route image TR1 and an actual vehicle route image TR2. The predicted vehicle route image TR1 and the actual vehicle route image TR2 are displayed together. See Fig. 5A. However, neither image has an adjusted display position, as required by claim 1.

Claim 1 also recites, “drive assisting image producing means for reading out said locus data corresponding to the steering angle detected by said steering angle detecting means from said data table.” Prior to the noted limitations, claim 1 never recites “locus data corresponding to the steering angle detected...” The claim merely recites “locus data” and “said locus data.” Therefore, the phrase “corresponding to the steering angle detected...” clearly modifies the verb “reading out” and not “said locus data.” Accordingly, claim 1 requires an image producing means that reads out locus data from a data table, and the reading out is corresponding to a steering angle.

Okamoto does not teach reading out locus data from a data table corresponding to a steering angle. Okamoto teaches that a predicted vehicle route image TR1 is generated based on a steering angle and then read from a memory. Although TR1 itself may be based on a steering angle, its *reading* from the memory is not *corresponding to a steering angle*.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Okamoto. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1-5 be withdrawn in view of the deficiencies of Okamoto.

Claim 6 recites, “a step for adjusting the display position of the travel prediction locus...based upon said adjusting data, and for displaying the position-adjusted travel prediction locus on the screen...” As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Okamoto teaches a predicted vehicle route image TR1. However, the display position of Okamoto’s image TR1 is not

adjusted based upon adjusting data. Therefore, Okamoto cannot teach displaying a "position-adjusted travel prediction locus," because it does not adjust the display position of the predicted vehicle route image TR1.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-39565.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: Brad C. Spencer
Brad C. Spencer – Reg. No. 57,076

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: August 14, 2008